

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

After entry of this amendment, claims 1-40 will remain pending in this application.

Claims 1-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,914,605 to Loughmiller et al. (Loughmiller). Reconsideration of these rejections and allowance of the pending claims in light of these remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Loughmiller. However, Loughmiller does not teach each and every element of this claim. For example, claim 1 recites "the graphics circuitry configured to request orientation information via the set of control lines upon detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by said communication protocol." Loughmiller does not provide this feature.

The pending Office Action cites Loughmiller, column 5, lines 39-66 as teaching these limitations. But Loughmiller does not teach detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by said communication protocol.

Rather, the cited passage teaches changing a displayed image as a vehicle moves. That is, as a vehicle moves, the displayed image rotates and moves accordingly. (See Loughmiller, column 5, lines 51-53.) This passage does not teach rotating or moving the image after detecting a modulation of a set of control lines that is undefined by a communication protocol. Accordingly, Loughmiller does not teach detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by said communication protocol as is required by the claim.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 should be allowed.

Other claims

Claims 12 and 24 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 35, 36, and 37 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1. For example, claim 35 recites "detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is undefined by

said master/slave communication protocol and not initiated by said graphics circuitry."

Loughmiller does not teach this.

Claim 38, 39, and 40 should be allowed for similar reasons as claim 1. For example, claim 38 recites "detecting a modulation of the set of control lines that is defined as an illegal operation by said communication protocol." Loughmiller does not teach this.

The other claims depend on one of the above claims and should be allowed for at least the same reasons, and for the additional limitations they recite.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal notice of allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

/ J. Matthew Zigmant /

J. Matthew Zigmant  
Reg. No. 44,005

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 415-576-0200  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
JMZ:deb  
61303186 v1